

REMARKS:

Claims 1, 3-4, 7, 10, 15, 19, 25-27, 29-31, 33, 35-36, 39-40, 43, 45, 49, 51-52, 55-56, 59, and 61 are amended as indicated above. Claims 1-64 remain pending upon entry of this amendment.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC § 101

Claims 1-32 stand rejected under 35 USC § 101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Examiner noted that the claimed invention appears “to be comprised of software alone without claimed associated computer hardware required for execution.” Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claims 1-32 are process claims, not computer program claims. Even if a process claim recites a process performed by a computer program, this recitation does not negate the fact that the claim is a process claim. MPEP 2106 IV.B.1(a) (“When a computer program is claimed in a process where the computer is executing the computer program’s instructions, Office personnel should treat the claim as a process claim.”)

Claims 1-32 are directed to statutory subject matter under 35 USC § 101. Because claims 1-32 are process claims, they are not subject to the tangible medium requirement for software. Also, because claims 1-32 describes practical applications – systems for automated enterprise event organization and management, they are statutory under 35 USC § 101. MPEP 2106 IV.B.2(b) (“a claim that requires one or more acts to be performed defines a process. ... To be statutory [under 35 USC 101], a claimed computer-related process must ... be limited to a practical application within the technological arts.”) Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC § 102(e)

Claims 1-64 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0156787 A1 to Jameson et al. (“Jameson”).

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

“allowing a user in communication with the website to create a **plurality of event pages describing an event ...**, each of the plurality of event pages being targeted to one of a plurality of participant groups, each of the plurality of participant groups comprising one or more participants...; forwarding a **first event page** of the plurality of event pages to a **first participant** of a first participant group...; forwarding a **second event page** of the plurality of event pages to a **second participant** of a second participant group ..., the first event page being different from the second event page, the first participant group being different from the second participant group ...”

Thus, claim 1 as amended recites a method allowing a user to generate multiple event pages for a single event, the pages targeted to different groups of participants. Different pages for the same event are sent to participants in different groups. This claimed invention is beneficial in that it allows a user who organizes an event to create different pages for participants playing different roles in the event (e.g., exhibitors, speakers, staff) and deliver targeted information about the event to the participants. Independent claims 33 and 49 similarly recite allowing a user to create multiple event pages describing an event and forwarding different event pages created by the user to participants in different groups.

Jameson, among other differences, does not disclose “allowing a user ... to create a **plurality of event pages describing an event**” and forwarding different event pages created by the user to members of different participant groups. Jameson, in contrast, discloses a web-based event planning and management system where a user can create a general purpose home page for an event, and send the URL of the general purpose event home page to all

potential attendees (See, e.g., page 4, paragraph 71; page 7, paragraph 95). Thus, Jameson does not allow a user to create different pages for the same event and send different event pages to participants in different groups. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 33, and 49 are patentably distinguishable over Jameson.

As to the dependent claims, because claims 2-32 are dependent on claim 1, claims 34-48 are dependent on claim 33, and claims 50-64 are dependent on claim 49, all arguments advanced above with respect to claims 1, 33, and 49 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claims 2-32, 34-48, and 50-64.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-64, as presented herein, recite statutory subject matter and are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference for the reasons described above. The claims not specifically mentioned above incorporate the limitations of their base claims and are believed allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the claims and application.

If the Examiner believes that there are any remaining issues to be resolved prior to allowance of this application, she is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned attorney directly to expediently resolve such concerns.

Respectfully Submitted,
JUSTIN T. NGUYEN ET AL.

Date: 3/6/06

By:



Brian M. Hoffman
Brian M. Hoffman, Reg. No. 39,713
Attorney for Applicants
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (415) 875-2484
Fax: (415) 281-1350